

App. No. 10/816,485
Office Action Dated April 4, 2006

REMARKS

Favorable reconsideration of this application is requested in view of the above amendments and the following remarks. Claims 1, 18, and 23 are hereby amended. Claims 4-7 are canceled without prejudice or disclaimer. Claim 25 is new.

Amendment of claim 1 is supported, for example, by page 15, lines 4-5. Claims 18 and 23 are amended to track with claim 1. New claim 25 is supported by page 18, line 37 to page 19, line 18.

Claims 1-7 were rejected as being anticipated by Argyrakis (US 5,373,109). Applicants traverse this rejection. Argyrakis does not disclose or suggest a wiring board including a plurality of conductive layers each including one wiring and having a same width as a width of an insulation layer immediately underneath thereof, as required by claim 1. Rather, Argyrakis teaches three layers of multiple electrically conductive signal carrying conductors (12, 14, 16). The conductors are narrower than an associated polyimide layer. See Figure 1. Applicants note that although the ground layers (18, 20, 22, and 24) have a same width as a polyimide layer (26, 27, 28, 29, 30) immediately underneath, the ground layers (18, 20, 22, and 24) do not transmit signals, as required by claim 1, and therefore cannot be considered equivalent to the claimed wirings of the conductive layers.

The configuration of the wiring board required by claim 1 provides a considerably thin conductive layer (wiring) since the conductive layer has the same width as that of the insulation layer immediately underneath thereof. Such a configuration allows a conductive layer to be formed easily, for example, by a vapor deposition method, a sputtering method, or a CVD method. Typically, a thinner conductive layer provides greater electrical resistance. However, by requiring the width of the conductive layer to be equal to that of the insulation layer, an increase in electrical resistance of the conductive layer can be avoided. A wiring of a conductive layer (12, 14, 16) according to Argyrakis, having a smaller width than that of the insulation layer (26, 27, 28, 29, 30), would cause an undesirable increase in electrical resistance if the wirings (12, 14, 16) were to be made thinner. Another advantage of the thin conductive layer (wiring)

App. No. 10/816,485
Office Action Dated April 4, 2006

provided by the wiring board of claim 1 is that each conductive layer is effective for high frequency signals, even when a skin effect due to high frequency occurs (see page 11, lines 28-35 of the current application).

Further, the thin conductive layer (wiring) provided by claim 1 decreases a lamination pitch and therefore increases the number of possible laminated layers. As a result, a wiring board that enables high-density connection with a plurality of circuit boards within a limited area is provided. See page 7, lines 4-7 of the current application.

Favorable reconsideration of claims 1-3 is requested.

New claim 25 should be considered allowable for at least the same reasons as claim 1, from which it depends. Favorable examination of new claim 25 is requested.

In view of the above, favorable reconsideration in the form of a notice of allowance is requested. Any questions regarding this communication can be directed to the undersigned attorney, Douglas P. Mueller, Reg. No. 30,300, at (612)455-3804.

Respectfully Submitted,



Douglas P. Mueller
Reg. No.: 30,300
Hamre, Schumann, Mueller & Larson, P.C.
225 South Sixth Street
Suite 2650
Minneapolis, MN 55402
612.455.3800

Dated: June 13, 2006



DPM:mfe